

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/746,132

Applicant(s)

BUSCHMANN, ULRICH

Examiner

Daniel A. Hess

Art Unit

2876

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Daniel A. Hess. (3) _____.

(2) Mr. Geza Ziegler. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 29 April; 2 May 05.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 2-9.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

JAH
Daniel Hess
5/2/2005

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

[Signature]
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The language of some claims were considered by the examiner to be somewhat awkward. In particular, the claims referred to 'the card' and 'the another card.' Permission was granted to change the language to 'first card' and 'second card' respectively, by examiner's amendment. Permission was also granted to make certain corrections that relate to using the word 'said' in relation to certain limitations the modify, in accordance with standard USPTO practice.